

Nine-year learning outcomes: Intellectual and academic skills

Academic ability

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.067				-.057				-.057				-.067			
Informal interaction (model)	-.103				.026				.136				-.106			

Writing

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.130				.120				.120				.130			
Informal interaction (model)	.118				.171	■	■	■	.107				-.083			

Listening ability

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.025				.037				.037				.025			
Informal interaction (model)	.012				.105				-.031				-.053			

Nine-year learning outcomes: Valued skills

General knowledge

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.043				-.052				-.052				-.043			
Informal interaction (model)	.028				-.027				.071				.143	■	■	■

Analytical and problem-solving skills

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.138	◇	◇	◇	-.133	◇		◇	-.133	◇	◇	◇	-.138	◇	◇	◇
Informal interaction (model)	.072				-.025				.029				.108			

Ability to think critically

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.107				.110				.110				.107			
Informal interaction (model)	-.007				.121				.089				-.042			

Writing skills

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.009				-.020				-.020				-.009			
Informal interaction (model)	.067				.108			■	.031				-.002			

Foreign language skills

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.132				.130				.130				.132			
Informal interaction (model)	.113				.044				-.075				.078			

Four-year democracy outcomes: Citizenship engagement

Influencing the political structure

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.094	■			.082	■			.082	■	■		.094	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.208	■	■	■	.222	■	■	■	.030				.005			

Influencing social values

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.114				.102				.102				.114			
Informal interaction (model)	.140	■	■	■	.202	■	■	■	.043				.101			

Helping others in difficulty

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.067				.084				.084				.067			
Informal interaction (model)	.197	■	■	■	.183	■	■	■	-.006				.178	■	■	■

Being involved in programs to clean up the environment

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.042				.040				.040				.042			
Informal interaction (model)	.007				-.093				.035				-.065			

Participating in a community action program

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.156	■			.158				.158				.156	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.151	■			.262	■	■	■	-.118				.123			

Four-year democracy outcomes: Racial/cultural engagement

Promoting racial understanding

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.253	■	■	■	.242	■			.242	■	■	■	.253	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.109				.430	■	■	■	.085				.164	■	■	■

Cultural awareness and appreciation

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.245	■	■	■	.249	■	■		.249	■	■	■	.245	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.164	■	■		.342	■	■	■	.005				.251	■	■	■

Acceptance of persons from different races/cultures

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.022				-.025				-.025				-.022			
Informal interaction (model)	.024				.013				.174	■	■	■	.029			

Nine-year democracy outcomes: Citizenship engagement

Hours/week spent in volunteer work/community service

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.089			
Informal interaction (model)	.042			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.091			
Informal interaction (model)	.074			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.091			
Informal interaction (model)	-.066			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.089			
Informal interaction (model)	.098			

Number of community service activities participated in

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.114			
Informal interaction (model)	.183	■	■	■

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.113			
Informal interaction (model)	.107			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.113			
Informal interaction (model)	.088			■

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.114			
Informal interaction (model)	.160	■	■	■

Community service reason: To give me a chance to work with people different from me

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.001			
Informal interaction (model)	.019			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.014			
Informal interaction (model)	.002			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.014			
Informal interaction (model)	-.126			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.001			
Informal interaction (model)	.087			

Community service reason: To improve society as a whole

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.088			
Informal interaction (model)	.061			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.078			
Informal interaction (model)	.104			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.078			
Informal interaction (model)	-.099			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.088			
Informal interaction (model)	.100			

Community service reason: To improve my community

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.094			
Informal interaction (model)	.263	■	■	■

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.089			
Informal interaction (model)	.153	■	■	

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.089			
Informal interaction (model)	.005			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.094			
Informal interaction (model)	.270	■	■	■

Community service reason: To fulfill my social responsibility

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.126			
Informal interaction (model)	.186	■	■	■

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.133			
Informal interaction (model)	.218	■	■	■

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.133			
Informal interaction (model)	.057			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.126			
Informal interaction (model)	-.010			

Influencing the political structure

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.003			
Informal interaction (model)	.022			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.005			
Informal interaction (model)	.021			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.005			
Informal interaction (model)	.099			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.003			
Informal interaction (model)	-.078			

Influencing social values

	Workshop model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.121			
Informal interaction (model)	.017			

	Discussion model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.116			
Informal interaction (model)	.082			

	Socializing model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.116			
Informal interaction (model)	-.124			

	Same race: Close friends in college model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.121			
Informal interaction (model)	.077			

Helping others in difficulty

	Workshop model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.177	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.181	■	■	■

	Discussion model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.199	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.081			

	Socializing model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.199	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	-.064			

	Same race: Close friends in college model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.177	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.229	■	■	■

Being involved in programs to clean up the environment

	Workshop model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.120	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.014			

	Discussion model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.119	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.045			

	Socializing model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.119	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.052			

	Same race: Close friends in college model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.120	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	-.050			

Participating in a community action program

	Workshop model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.180	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.204	■	■	■

	Discussion model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.190	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.222	■	■	■

	Socializing model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.190	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	-.115			

	Same race: Close friends in college model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.180	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.312	■	■	■

Nine-year democracy outcomes: Racial/Cultural engagement

Promoting racial understanding

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.143			
Informal interaction (model)	.107			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.147			
Informal interaction (model)	.184	■	■	

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.147			
Informal interaction (model)	.113			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.143			
Informal interaction (model)	.146			

Cultural awareness and appreciation

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.235	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.191	■	■	■

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.235	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.193	■		

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.235	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	-.076			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.235	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.171	■		

Acceptance of persons from different races/cultures

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.132			
Informal interaction (model)	.121	■		

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.136			
Informal interaction (model)	.105			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.136			
Informal interaction (model)	.149			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.132			
Informal interaction (model)	.011			

Nine-year outcomes: Living / working in a diverse society

How well did your undergraduate education prepare you for graduate school?

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Close friends in college were diverse model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.224	■	■	■	.233	■	■	■	.233	■	■	■	.224	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.134	■			.138				.130				.051			

How well did your undergraduate education prepare your current/most recent job?

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Close friends in college were diverse model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.004				.011				.011				.004			
Informal interaction (model)	.091				-.122		◆	◆	.132				-.003			

Past year: Discussed racial/ethnic issues

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Close friends in college were diverse model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.172	■	■		.160	■			.160	■	■		.172	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.122				.327	■	■	■	.063				-.262	◆	◆	◆

Past year: Socialized with someone of another racial/ethnic group

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Close friends in college were diverse model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.029				-.018				-.018				-.029			
Informal interaction (model)	-.078				-.134				.242	■	■	■	.378	■	■	■

Current close friends are diverse

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Close friends in college were diverse model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.082				.085				.085				.082			
Informal interaction (model)	.204	■	■		.124				-.218	◆	◆	◆	.733	■	■	■

Current neighbors are diverse

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Close friends in college were diverse model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.008				-.016				-.016				-.008			
Informal interaction (model)	.144				-.061				-.172				.247			

Current work associates are diverse

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Close friends in college were diverse model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.099	◆			-.098				-.098		◆		-.099	◆	◆	
Informal interaction (model)	-.047				-.049				-.112				.193			

Table D3
Detailed regression summary tables: CIRP data base, Latino students

Significant positive effects: ■
Significant negative effects: ❖

Outcome variable

Four-year learning outcomes: Engagement and motivation

Graduate degree aspirations

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.151				.139				.139				.148			
Informal interaction (model)	.030				.157	■	■	■	.155				.072			

Drive to achieve

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.142				.151			■	.151			■	.141			■
Informal interaction (model)	.206	■	■	■	.065				.038				.090			

Self-confidence (Intellectual)

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.090				.088				.088				.092			
Informal interaction (model)	.059				-.055				.006				.079			

Write original works (poems, novels, short stories, etc.)

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.024				.015				.015				.017			
Informal interaction (model)	.100				-.037				.074				-.060			

Create artistic works (painting, sculpture, decorating, etc.)

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.003				-.013				-.013				-.010			
Informal interaction (model)	.200	■	■	■	.002				-.014				-.120			

Preparation for graduate/professional school

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.137		■	■	.136			■	.136			■	.136			
Informal interaction (model)	-.123		❖	❖	.011				.053				.076			

Four-year learning outcomes: Intellectual and academic skills

Average undergraduate grade point average (self-reported)

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.109			■	.117		■	■	.117			■	.109			■
Informal interaction (model)	.063				-.056				.007				.156	■	■	

General knowledge

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.106				.114				.114				.114			
Informal interaction (model)	.133				.059				.070				-.034			

Academic ability

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.132	■		■	.140	■	■	■	.140	■	■	■	.130	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.107	■			.046				.022				.068			

Writing

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.057				.065				.065				.060			
Informal interaction (model)	.151	■	■	■	.156	■	■	■	.100				.027			

Listening ability

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.008				.027				.027				.020			
Informal interaction (model)	.002				.045				.171	■	■	■	.063			

Analytical and problem-solving skills

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.077				.068				.068				.072			
Informal interaction (model)	.063				.042				.024				.003			

Ability to think critically

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.134				.133				.133				.128			
Informal interaction (model)	.117				.143				.071				.076			

Writing skills

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.117				.128				.128				.129			
Informal interaction (model)	.022				.090				.018				.024			

Foreign language skills

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.232	■	■	■	.248	■	■	■	.248	■	■	■	.243	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.178	■			.050				.024				.068			

Nine-year learning outcomes: Engagement and motivation

Drive to achieve

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.187				.202	■		■	.202	■	■	■	.197	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.148				.168				.015				-.003			

Self-confidence (Intellectual)

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.030				.048				.048				.045			
Informal interaction (model)	.036				.071				-.033				.045			

Write original works (poems, novels, short stories, etc.)

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.150	■			.134				.134				.142	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.127	■			.042				.048				-.110	◇	◇	

Create artistic works (painting, sculpture, decorating, etc.)

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.045				-.056				-.056				-.053			
Informal interaction (model)	.005				-.057				-.016				-.146	◇	◇	◇

Nine-year learning outcomes: Intellectual and academic skills

Academic ability

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.056				.049				.049				.053			
Informal interaction (model)	.020				.137	■			.094				-.065			

Writing

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.056				-.061				-.061				-.054			
Informal interaction (model)	.050				.121	■	■	■	.082				.017			

Listening ability

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.173	■	■		.173	■	■		.173	■			.171	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.060				.093				.195	■	■		.004			

Nine-year learning outcomes: Valued skills

General knowledge

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.135	■			.126				.126				.125		■	
Informal interaction (model)	.104				.025				.042				-.027			

Analytical and problem-solving skills

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.012				.020				.020				.008			
Informal interaction (model)	.020				.052				-.068				.054			

Ability to think critically

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.006				-.026				-.026				-.017			
Informal interaction (model)	-.070				-.031				-.028				.039			

Writing skills

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.139				.134				.134				.136		■	
Informal interaction (model)	.218	■	■		.065				-.011				.110			

Foreign language skills

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.333	■	■	■	.331	■	■	■	.331	■	■	■	.334	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.213	■			.105				-.072				.174			

Four-year democracy outcomes: Citizenship engagement

Influencing the political structure

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.153	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.171	■		

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.153	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.259	■	■	■

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.153	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.075			

Same race: Close friends in college model				
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.152	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.032			

Influencing social values

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.072			
Informal interaction (model)	.123			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.051			
Informal interaction (model)	.099			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.051			
Informal interaction (model)	-.004			

Same race: Close friends in college model				
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.065			
Informal interaction (model)	-.049			

Helping others in difficulty

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.198	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.171	■		

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.198	■		■
Informal interaction (model)	.149			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.198	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.066			

Same race: Close friends in college model				
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.196	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.023			

Being involved in programs to clean up the environment

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.215			
Informal interaction (model)	.199	■		

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.212			
Informal interaction (model)	.100			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.212			
Informal interaction (model)	.072			

Same race: Close friends in college model				
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.209			
Informal interaction (model)	.037			

Participating in a community action program

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.233	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.290	■	■	■

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.228	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.309	■	■	■

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.228	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.198	■	■	■

Same race: Close friends in college model				
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.238	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	-.061			

Four-year democracy outcomes: Racial/cultural engagement

Promoting racial understanding

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.362	■	■	■	.356	■	■	■	.356	■	■	■	.362	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.267	■			.477	■	■	■	.316	■	■	■	-.001			

Cultural awareness and appreciation

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.228	■	■		.202	■			.202	■	■		.210	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.257	■	■		.307	■	■	■	.133				.056			

Acceptance of persons from different races/cultures

Predictors	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.113				.095				.095				.101			
Informal interaction (model)	.132				.225	■	■	■	.129	■	■		.117			

Nine-year democracy outcomes: Citizenship engagement

Hours/week spent in volunteer work/community service

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.167	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.134			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.154	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.234	■	■	■

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.154	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.099			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.159	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.108			

Number of community service activities participated in

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.140	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.038			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.126			
Informal interaction (model)	.071			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.126			
Informal interaction (model)	.145	■		

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.133	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.154			

Community service reason: To give me a chance to work with people different from me

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.018			
Informal interaction (model)	.118			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.007			
Informal interaction (model)	-.030			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.007			
Informal interaction (model)	.019			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.018			
Informal interaction (model)	.083			

Community service reason: To improve society as a whole

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.031			
Informal interaction (model)	.229	■	■	■

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.022			
Informal interaction (model)	.109			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.022			
Informal interaction (model)	.001			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.016			
Informal interaction (model)	-.020			

Community service reason: To improve my community

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.016			
Informal interaction (model)	.107			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.028			
Informal interaction (model)	.008			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.028			
Informal interaction (model)	.077			■

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.023			
Informal interaction (model)	.220	■	■	■

Community service reason: To fulfill my social responsibility

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.101			
Informal interaction (model)	.038			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.114			
Informal interaction (model)	.100			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.114			
Informal interaction (model)	.110			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.115			
Informal interaction (model)	.068	■	■	■

Influencing the political structure

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.066			
Informal interaction (model)	.047			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.073			
Informal interaction (model)	.200	■	■	■

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.073			
Informal interaction (model)	.022			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.080			
Informal interaction (model)	.091			

Influencing social values

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.056			
Informal interaction (model)	-.024			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.053			
Informal interaction (model)	.012			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.053			
Informal interaction (model)	-.025			

Same race: Close friends in college model

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.061			
Informal interaction (model)	-.081			

Helping others in difficulty

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.142			
Informal interaction (model)	.097			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.134			■
Informal interaction (model)	-.018			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.134			■
Informal interaction (model)	-.153			

Same race: Close friends in college model

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.141			
Informal interaction (model)	.190	■		

Being involved in programs to clean up the environment

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.094			
Informal interaction (model)	.272	■	■	■

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.085			
Informal interaction (model)	-.064			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.085			
Informal interaction (model)	-.150			

Same race: Close friends in college model

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.089			
Informal interaction (model)	.136			

Participating in a community action program

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.219	■		■
Informal interaction (model)	.143			

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.205			■
Informal interaction (model)	.143			

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.205			■
Informal interaction (model)	.135			

Same race: Close friends in college model

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.214	■		■
Informal interaction (model)	.103			

Nine-year democracy outcomes: Racial/Cultural engagement

Promoting racial understanding

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.228	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.214	■		

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.213	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.286	■	■	■

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.213	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.057			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.217	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.106			

Cultural awareness and appreciation

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.278	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.194	■		

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.278	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.152	■		

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.278	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	-.014			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.285	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	-.003			

Acceptance of persons from different races/cultures

Predictors	Workshop model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.218	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.242	■	■	■

Predictors	Discussion model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.218	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.239	■	■	

Predictors	Socializing model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.218	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.047			

Predictors	Same race: Close friends in college model			
	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.224	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	-.085			

Nine-year outcomes: Living / working in a diverse society

How well did your undergraduate education prepare you for graduate school?

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				were diverse model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.256	■	■	■	.262	■	■	■	.262	■	■	■	.265	■	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	-.011				.079				.089				-.056			

How well did your undergraduate education prepare your current/most recent job?

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Classroom model in college were diverse model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.156				.154		■		.154				.159		■	
Informal interaction (model)	.118				.002				.020				.002			

Past year: Discussed racial/ethnic issues

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Class models in college were diverse model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.240	■	■	■	.233	■			.233	■	■	■	.229	■	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.041				.408	■	■	■	.232	■	■		-.079	◆	◆	◆

Past year: Socialized with someone of another racial/ethnic group

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				were diverse in college			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.138		■	■	.135				.135				.142			
Informal interaction (model)	-.176	◆	◆	◆	.142				.373	■	■	■	.035			

Current close friends are diverse

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				Socializing model with diverse students			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	.139	■		■	.134	■	■	■	.134	■	■	■	.133	■		
Informal interaction (model)	.217	■	■	■	-.056				-.200		◆		.723	■	■	■

Current neighbors are diverse

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				were diverse model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.073				-.077				-.077				-.081			
Informal interaction (model)	.025				-.189				-.173				.436	■	■	■

Current work associates are diverse

	Workshop model				Discussion model				Socializing model				were diverse model			
Predictors	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	r	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Classroom	-.022				-.025				-.025				-.023			
Informal interaction (model)	.064				-.074				-.224	♦	♦	♦	.377	■	■	■

Table D4
Detailed regression summary tables: MSS data base, White students

Significant positive effects: ■
Significant negative effects: ◆

Outcome variable

Learning outcomes: Active thinking

Complex thinking

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with African Americans model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.281	■	■	.281	■	■	.276	■	■	.276	■	■	.276	■	■	.280	■	■	.277	■	■	.273	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.193	■	■	-.076			.024			.003			.030			.118			-.162	◆		.207	■	

Social historical thinking

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with African Americans model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.331	■	■	.331	■	■	.334	■	■	.334	■	■	.334	■	■	.341	■	■	.334	■	■	.332	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.220	■	■	.018			.064			-.011			.055			.150			-.183	◆	◆	.306	■	

Learning outcomes: Engagement and motivation

Intellectual engagement

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with African Americans model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.090	■	■	.088	■	■	.092	■	■	.092	■	■	.092	■	■	.088	■	■	.091	■	■	.092	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.005			-.055			.014			-.022			-.004			.077			.028			.086	■	

Graduate school intentions

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with African Americans model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.085	■	■	.084	■	■	.083	■	■	.083	■	■	.083	■	■	.090	■	■	.085	■	■	.083	■	■
Informal interaction (model)	.092	■	■	-.008			.023			-.005			.014			.069			-.025			.087	■	

Democracy outcomes: Compatibility of differences

Commonality with African Americans

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with African Americans model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.051			.051			.052			.052			.052			.055			.055			.057		
Informal interaction (model)	.092			-.112	◆	◆	.214	■	■	.196	■	■	.106			.000			-.084			.142	■	

Commonality with Asian Americans

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with African Americans model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.049			.049			.047			.047			.047			.046			.045			.042		
Informal interaction (model)	.162	■	■	-.127	◆	◆	.189	■	■	.045			.112	■	■	.061			.005			.117	■	

Commonality with Latinos

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with African Americans model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.083			.083			.084			.084			.084			.082			.082			.084		
Informal interaction (model)	.103	■		-.109	◆	◆	.191	■	■	.100			.079			.030			-.089	◆		.119	■	

Difference is nondivisive

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with African Americans model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.175	■	■	.171	■	■	.175	■	■	.175	■	■	.175	■	■	.179	■	■	.177	■	■	.174	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.055			-.039			.030			.112	■	■	.081	■	■	.083	■		-.092	◆		.206	■	

Democracy outcomes: Citizenship engagement

Perspective taking

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with African Americans model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.186	■	■	.186	■	■	.185	■	■	.185	■	■	.185	■	■	.190	■	■	.185	■	■	.184	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.162	■	■	-.096	◆	◆	.129	■	■	.078			.068			.062			.015			.144		

Democracy outcomes: Racial/cultural engagement

Learned about other groups

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with African Americans model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.310	■	■	.313	■	■	.315	■	■	.316	■	■	.315	■	■	.316	■	■	.319	■	■	.319	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.142	■	■	.019			.162	■	■	.156	■	■	.101	■	■	.100	■	■	-.154	◆	◆	.181	■	

Table D5
Detailed regression summary tables: MSS data base, African American students

Significant positive effects: ■
Significant negative effects: ◆

Outcome variable

Learning outcomes: Active thinking

Complex thinking

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with White students model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.055			.055			.054			.054			.054			.067			.054			.069		
Informal interaction (model)	.165			.011			.141			.008			-.020			-.029			.030			.088		

Social historical thinking

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with White students model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.349	■	■	.349	■	■	.353	■	■	.353	■	■	.353	■	■	.369	■	■	.353	■	■	.364	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.187			.164			.138			-.026			-.076			.114	■		.095			.156		

Learning outcomes: Engagement and motivation

Intellectual engagement

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with White students model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.054			.054			.069			.069			.069			.082			.070			.096	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.244	■	■	-.047			.082			.210	■	■	.164			-.010			.012			.062		

Graduate school intentions

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with White students model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.160	■	■	.160	■	■	.172	■	■	.172	■	■	.172	■	■	.164	■	■	.172	■	■	.195	■	
Informal interaction (model)	.036			.017			.021			-.107		◆	-.111	◆		-.046			-.075			.136	■	

Democracy outcomes: Compatibility of differences

Commonality with African Americans

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with White students model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.184			.184			.198			.198			.198			.202			.198			.189		
Informal interaction (model)	.137			-.225		◆	-.142		◆	.083			.127			-.146			.247		■	-.145		

Commonality with Asian Americans

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with White students model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.013			.013			.029			.029			.029			.015			.029			.029		
Informal interaction (model)	.217		■	-.070			.303		■	.258		■	.162		■	.239		■	-.098			.001		

Commonality with Latinos

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with White students model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.199			.199			.232		■	.232		■	.232		■	.245		■	.232		■	.232		■
Informal interaction (model)	-.008			.034			.233		■	-.013			-.101			.219		■	-.145			.258		■

Difference is nondivisive

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with White students model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.127		■	.127		■	.137		■	.137		■	.137		■	.135		■	.137		■	.147		■
Informal interaction (model)	.057			.121		■	.175		■	.047			-.034			.084			-.086			.190		

Democracy outcomes: Citizenship engagement

Perspective taking

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with White students model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.047			.047			.079			.079			.079			.088			.079			.088		
Informal interaction (model)	.144			-.129			.103			.131		■	-.009			.019			-.265		◆	.198		■

Democracy outcomes: Racial/cultural engagement

Learned about other groups

	Personal interactions model			Negative interactions model			Amount of interaction with students of color model			Amount of interaction with White students model			Diversity of 6 best friends model			Participation with other groups model			Dialogue groups model			Number of multicultural events attended model		
	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2	r	Step 1	Step 2
Classroom diversity	.345		■	.345		■	.344		■	.344		■	.344		■	.349		■	.347		■	.358		■
Informal interaction (model)	.093		■	.014			.173		■	.118		■	-.071			.025			-.158		◆	.007		

APPENDIX E

CLASSROOM AND INFORMAL INTERACTIONAL DIVERSITY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

To provide context for the data presented in my statement of the impact of classroom and informal interactional diversity at Michigan, this appendix

presents some findings from the Michigan Student Study on how Michigan students experience these two types of diversity.

Classroom Diversity

Classroom diversity was measured by an index constructed from two questions in the senior questionnaire. In one question students were asked to indicate, on a five-point scale ranging from "not at all" to "a great deal", the extent to which they had "been exposed" in their classes to "information and activities devoted to understanding other racial/ethnic groups and inter-racial ethnic relationships." In an attempt to measure the salience and impact of the diversity content that students encountered in their classes, the other question in this index asked students to indicate whether or not there had been a course at the university that had "an important impact on your views of racial/ethnic diversity and multiculturalism."

The different student groups at the University of Michigan varied somewhat in their involvement with diversity in their classes, although for many students in all groups this involvement was significant.

Among students of color, African American students had the most involvement with classroom diversity. Asian Americans had the least involvement, reflecting the fact that they more often majored in the natural sciences and engineering where diversity content is less relevant to the

curriculum. Among African Americans, 40% indicated extensive ("quite a bit" or "a great deal") exposure to diversity content in their courses. An equal proportion indicated that their views on diversity had been significantly influenced by some course at Michigan. About one quarter of the Asian American students indicated extensive exposure and one quarter also indicated significant impact on their views on diversity.

Among white students, about one third (35%) indicated extensive exposure to diversity in their classes, and 28% said that this had a significant impact on them.

The two questions in the classroom diversity index do not explicitly indicate whether or not exposure to content on ethnicity and race through courses was a positive or negative experience. However, student responses to an open-ended question that followed the question on course impact suggest that the classroom effects were viewed as predominantly positive. This question asked students who identified a course that had affected their views on diversity to indicate "in what ways it changed your views." Over 95% of the students indicated that the impact of the course was positive. A few percent wrote about being "turned off" by the course.

Pre-College and College Interactions with Diverse Students

Pre-College Experience with Diversity

Students of different racial and ethnic groups come to Michigan with strikingly different experiences with racial and ethnic diversity. White students come from the most segregated backgrounds and hence have the most to learn from the racial/ethnic diversity they find at Michigan.

Ninety-two percent of Michigan's white students grew up in neighborhoods that were predominantly white, and 83% went to

predominantly white high schools. In contrast, very few of the Latino and Asian American students had a segregated community or high school background: a little over 70% of them grew up in neighborhoods that were predominantly white, and two-thirds went to predominantly white high schools. About half of the African American students grew up in integrated or predominantly white neighborhoods, and 60% went to high schools that were integrated or predominantly white.

Extent of Interracial Relationships at Michigan

Michigan students indicate a considerable degree of interracial contact in their general relationships on the Michigan campus. For white students, who come from the most segregated backgrounds, this represents a significant increase over their pre-college experiences with personal interactions across racial and ethnic lines.

In response to a question that asked seniors to rate the "interactions they have with students from various racial/ethnic groups on campus," 40% of the white students indicated having "substantial" interaction with Asian American students and another 40% indicated having "some" interaction.

Twenty percent indicated "substantial" interaction and 45% "some" interaction with African American students. Despite the relatively low number of Latino students at Michigan, almost half the white students indicated at least "some" interaction with them.

The extent of interracial relationships is even greater among students of color, which is a reflection of the predominance of white students on the Michigan campus. Ninety-one percent of the Latino students, 86% of the Asian Americans, and 50% of the African American students have "substantial" interactions with white students.

Quality of Interracial Interactions

In addition to fairly extensive interracial interactions on the Michigan campus, the quality of these interactions is predominantly positive, particularly between white students and Asian Americans and Latinos. Students were asked to describe their relationships with the group they interacted most with on the Michigan campus. Latino and white students (and Asian American and white students) tend to view their relationships with each other as involving considerable cooperation and personal sharing, and very little hostility and tension. For example,

approximately two-fifths (39%) of the white students said they "studied together" with Latino students "quite a bit" or "a great deal", and two thirds (68%) of the white students said that they "shared personal feelings and problems" in these relationships. Moreover, only 7% of the white students said they "had tense, somewhat hostile interactions" with Latino students "quite a bit" or "a great deal", and only 1% said they "had guarded, cautious interactions" this often.

About two-fifths (38%) of the white students said they "studied together" extensively with Asian American students, and about half (49%) said that they "shared personal feelings and problems" in these relationships. Only 1% of the white students said that these relationships involve extensive "tense, somewhat hostile interactions," and only 2% felt these interactions were extensively "guarded, cautious."

Their relationships with white students were viewed even more positively by Latino and Asian American students. Seventy-three percent of the Latino students and 67% of the Asian Americans said they "studied together" with white students "quite a bit" or "a great deal"; 85% of the Latino students and 70% of the Asian American students said they "shared personal feelings and problems" in these relationships. About 10% felt that these interactions were "tense, somewhat hostile" and "guarded, cautious."

Relationships that white students had with African American students were somewhat less

personal than their relationships with other students of color, but very few white students felt that their interactions with African Americans were negative. Fourteen percent of the white students said that "they studied together" with African American students "quite a bit" or "a great deal"; 29% said that they "shared personal feelings and problems" in these relationships. Only 4% of the white students said that they "had tense, somewhat hostile interactions" with African American students, and only 1% said these relationships were "guarded and cautious."

From the perspective of African American students, their relationships with white students were somewhat ambivalent, reflecting negative as well as positive interactions. Twenty-six percent of the African American students said that they "studied together" extensively with white students, and 25% said that they "shared personal feelings and problems." Twenty-three percent of the African American students said that their relationships with white students were "guarded and cautious," and 15% felt that they were "tense, somewhat hostile."

Close Friendships

In addition to questions about their general interracial interactions on campus, the Michigan seniors were asked to indicate the race/ethnicity of their six closest friends at Michigan. Since students were also asked to identify race/ethnicity of their six closest friends at the time they entered Michigan, we can measure the increase in the racial/ethnic diversity of the most intimate friendships. This question is particularly pertinent for African American and white students since Asian American and Latino students came to Michigan from predominantly white environments. At the time they entered Michigan, three or more of the six best friends of 87% of the Latino students were not Latino, and three or more of the six best friends of 73% of the Asian American students were not Asian American.

While close friendship circles of African American and white students are predominantly with peers of their own backgrounds both at entrance and after four years at the University of Michigan, there is a significant increase in the racial/ethnic diversity of such friendships.

The proportion of white students who had at least one close friend of color (among their six best friends) increased from about one third (32%) at the time they entered Michigan to almost half (46%) four years later. African American students with at least one close friend who was not African American increased from slightly less than half (47%) at time of entrance to slightly more than half (54%) when they were seniors.

While one might hope that even more African American and white students would have increased their closest friendships with each other while at Michigan, the overall picture of interracial relationships at Michigan is predominantly positive.

It does not conform to the views of those in the public debate who have claimed that affirmative action has created hostile interracial environments on our college campuses.

EXPERT REPORT OF WILLIAM G. BOWEN

Gratz, et al. v. Bollinger, et al., No. 97-75321 (E.D. Mich.)

I. Statement of Qualifications:

I am currently the president of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation; I have held that position since 1988. Prior to that, I served as president of Princeton University for sixteen years, from 1972 to 1988, and as provost for five years, from 1967 to 1972. I was a Professor of Economics at Princeton University from 1965 until 1988; I had been a member of the faculty since

1958. I currently serve as a member of several corporate boards, including American Express and Merck & Co., Inc. I have written extensively about issues of higher education, including the consideration of race in admissions. A complete *curriculum vitae*, including a list of publications, is attached hereto as Appendix A.

II. Information Considered in Forming Opinions:

My opinions are based, in large part, on The Shape of the River: Long-Term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University

Admissions, William G. Bowen and Derek Bok, Princeton University Press (1998). A copy of the book will be provided upon request.

III. Other expert testimony; compensation:

I have not testified as an expert at trial or by deposition within the preceding four years. I am not receiving any

compensation for my work in connection with this matter.

IV. Opinions to be expressed and the basis and reasons therefor:

Higher education plays a unique role in our society. The obligation of a university is to the society at large over the long run, and, even more generally, to the pursuit of learning. Although this may seem amorphous, there is no escaping a university's obligation to try to serve the long-term interests of society defined in the broadest and least parochial terms, and to do so through two principal activities: advancing knowledge and educating students who will in turn serve others, within this nation and beyond it, both through their specific vocations and as citizens. Universities therefore are responsible for imparting civic and democratic values that are essential to the functioning of our nation.

Our society -- indeed, our world -- is and will continue to be multi-racial. We simply must learn to work more effectively and more sensitively

with individuals of other races, and a diverse student body can make a profound and direct contribution to the achievement of this end. In the 1960s, barely one percent of law students and two percent of medical students in America were black. At that time, few leading professional schools and nationally prominent colleges and universities enrolled more than a handful of blacks. Late in the decade, however, selective institutions set about to change these statistics, not by establishing quotas, but by considering race, along with many other factors, in assembling a diverse student body of varying talents, backgrounds, and perspectives. Schools sought to achieve diversity to cross the racial borders that separated large segments of society and to reap the educational benefits to all students of learning on a diverse campus, in which they would transcend the misperceptions and stereotypes that had been borne of racial separation.

These selective institutions recognized that a student body containing many different backgrounds, talents, and experiences would be a richer environment in which all students could better develop into productive, contributing members of our society.

Amid much passionate debate, there has been little hard evidence of how these policies work and what their consequences have been. To remedy this deficiency, Derek Bok and I examined the college experiences of more than 60,000 students -- approximately 3,500 of whom were black -- who had entered 28 selective colleges and universities in the fall of 1976 and the fall of 1989;^{1/} we also surveyed a sub-set of these students (with a survey response rate of about 80%) and thus studied the later life experiences and views of 30,000 students. This massive database, built jointly by the schools and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, for the first time links information such as Scholastic Assessment Test ("SAT") scores and college majors to experiences after college, including graduate and professional degrees, earnings, and civic involvement. Most of our study focused on African-Americans and whites, because the Latino and Native American populations at these schools were too small in 1976 to permit the same sort of statistical analysis. Nevertheless, many of the findings may be applicable to these groups as well. Our conclusions are set forth in The Shape of the

^{1/} The 28 colleges and universities are: Barnard College, Bryn Mawr College, Columbia University, Denison College, Duke University, Emory University, Hamilton College, Kenyon College, Miami University (Ohio), Northwestern University, Oberlin College, Pennsylvania State University, Princeton University, Rice University, Smith College, Stanford University, Swarthmore College, Tufts University, Tulane University, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, University of Pennsylvania, Vanderbilt University, Washington University, Wellesley College, Wesleyan University, Williams College, and Yale University.

River: Long-Term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions. William G. Bowen and Derek Bok, Princeton University Press (1998). This report attempts to summarize some of our findings. My testimony in this case will draw upon the book, as well as my 40 years of experience in academia, including my tenure as provost (five years) and president (16 years) of Princeton University, and my experience as a member of several corporate boards.

As a necessary predicate, a university must have the freedom to decide which students it will admit and which criteria it will use in its admissions decisions. This academic freedom is crucial in order for a school to fulfill its mission. At bottom, admissions officers must decide which set of applicants, *considered individually and collectively*, will take fullest advantage of what the college has to offer, contribute most to the educational process in college, and be most successful in using what they have learned for the benefit of the larger society.

Any college or university to which admissions is highly competitive, such as the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, has far more applicants who possess all the basic qualifications than it has places. Some candidates (a relatively small number) are so outstanding in every respect that they are obvious choices for admission by any standard. The real problems of choice arise in deciding which individuals to admit from among the large group who also have very strong qualifications, who are thought capable of doing the work and doing it well, but who are not so clearly outstanding as to be placed in the very top category.

In my experience, in deciding among this group, a school does not start from the premise that any applicant has a "right" to a place in a college or university. Instead, the starting premise is that a school has an obligation to make the best possible use of the limited number of places in each entering class so as to advance as effectively as possible the broad purposes the school seeks to serve. Within the very real limits imposed by the fallibility of any selection process of this kind, a school should try

hard to be fair to every applicant; but the concept of fairness itself has to be understood within the context of the obligations of a university. Accordingly, in making these difficult choices among well-qualified candidates, considerations other than just test scores and grades come into play.

The relevance of these other considerations is based on the premise that the overall quality of the educational program is affected not only by the qualities of the individual students who are enrolled, but also by the characteristics of the entire group of students who share a common educational experience. While I believe this to be true for graduate programs too, my own experience confirms the importance for undergraduate education and, as a consequence, affects admission decisions much more significantly at that level. If there is a difference, it is only one of degree, related partly to the ages and experiences of the students, partly to the purposes of their educational programs and especially to the emphasis given to academic specialization, and partly to the respective roles of extracurricular and curricular activities.

In a residential college setting, in particular, a great deal of learning occurs informally. It occurs through interactions among students of both sexes; of different races, religions, and backgrounds; who come from cities and rural areas, from various states and countries; who have a wide variety of interests, talents, and perspectives; and who are able, directly or indirectly, to learn from their differences and to stimulate one another to reexamine even their most deeply held assumptions about themselves and their world. As a wise graduate of Princeton University observed in commenting on this aspect of the educational process, "People do not learn very much when they are surrounded only by the likes of themselves."

It follows that if, say, 2,000 individuals are to be offered places in an entering undergraduate class, the task of an admissions office is not simply to decide which applicants offer the strongest credentials as separate candidates for the college; the task, rather, is to assemble a total class of

students, all of whom will possess the basic qualifications, but who will also represent, in their totality, an interesting and diverse amalgam of individuals who will contribute through their diversity to the quality and vitality of the overall educational environment.

This concern for the composition of the undergraduate student body, as well as for the qualifications of its individual members, takes many forms. While a school is of course interested in enrolling students who are good at a great many things and not one-dimensional in any sense, it should also try to enroll students with special interests and talents in the arts and in athletics; it should seek a wide geographical representation; it should admit foreign students from a variety of countries and cultures; it should recognize the special contribution that the sons and daughters of alumni can make by representing and communicating a sense of the traditions and the historical continuity of the university; it should enroll students from a range of socioeconomic backgrounds; and it should work consciously and deliberately to include minority students, who themselves represent a variety of experiences and viewpoints.

We must accept as a fact of life in contemporary America that the perspectives of individuals are often affected by their race as by other aspects of their background. If a university were unable to take into account the race of candidates, it would be much more difficult to consider carefully and conscientiously the composition of an entering class that would offer a rich educational experience to all of its members. The unplanned, casual encounters with roommates, fellow sufferers in an organic chemistry class, student workers in the library, teammates on a basketball squad, or other participants in class affairs or student government can be subtle and yet powerful sources of improved understanding and personal growth.

Indeed, the data in our study prove what I have observed for years through experience -- that diversity is valued and that "learning through

diversity" actually occurs. Our study indicates that diversity is a benefit for all students, minorities and nonminorities alike. Moreover, the data overwhelmingly demonstrate that minority students admitted to selective schools had strong academic credentials, graduated in large numbers and did very well after leaving college. By every measure of success (graduation, attainment of professional degrees, employment, earnings, civic participation, and overall satisfaction), the more selective the school, the more blacks achieved (holding constant their initial test scores and grades).

It is true that compared with their extremely high-achieving white classmates, black students in general received somewhat lower college grades and graduated at moderately lower rates. The reasons for these disparities are not fully understood, and selective institutions need to be more creative in helping improve black performance, as a few universities already have succeeded in doing. Still, 75 percent graduated within six years from the school they first entered, a figure well above the 40 percent of blacks and 59 percent of whites who graduated nationwide from the 305 universities tracked by the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Moreover, blacks did not earn degrees from these selective schools by majoring in easy subjects. They chose substantially the same concentrations as whites and were just as likely to have difficult majors, such as those in the sciences and engineering. These and other findings refute the argument that when black students are admitted to schools where many other students have stronger academic qualifications than their own -- as measured by grades and test scores -- that those students not only will drop out, but that they would have been better off attending a less selective institution.

Although over half of the black students attending these selective schools would have been rejected under a race-neutral admissions regime -- that is, if only the same proportions of black and white students had been admitted within each SAT interval -- they have done exceedingly well after college. Fifty-six percent of the black graduates who had entered these selective schools in 1976

went on to earn advanced degrees. A remarkable 40 percent received either PhDs or professional degrees in the most sought-after fields of law, business and medicine, a figure slightly higher than that for their white classmates and five times higher than that for blacks with bachelor's degrees nationwide. (As a measure of change, it is worth noting that by 1995, 7.5 percent of all law students in the United States were black, up from barely 1 percent in 1960; and 8.1 percent of medical school students were black, compared with 2.2 percent in the mid-1960s. Black elected officials now number more than 8,600.)

By the time of our survey, black male graduates who had entered selective schools in 1976 were earning an average of \$85,000 a year, 82 percent more than other black male college graduates nationwide. Their black female classmates earned 73 percent more than all black women with bachelor's degrees. Not only has the marketplace valued the work of these graduates highly, but the premium associated with attending one of these selective institutions was substantial. Overall, we found that among blacks with similar test scores, the more selective the college they attended, the more likely they were to graduate, earn advanced degrees and receive high salaries. This was generally true for whites as well.

Despite their high salaries, the blacks in our study were not just concerned with their own advancement. In virtually every type of civic activity, from social service organizations to parent associations, black men were more likely than their white classmates to hold leadership positions. Much the same pattern holds for women. These findings should reassure black intellectuals who have worried that blacks -- especially black men -- would ignore their social responsibilities once they achieved financial success.

Were black students demoralized by having to compete with whites with higher high school grades and test scores? Is it true, as Dinesh D'Souza asserts in his book "Illiberal Education," that "American universities are quite willing to sacrifice the future happiness of many young blacks and Hispanics to achieve diversity, proportional

representation, and what they consider to be multicultural progress"? The facts are very clear on this point. Far from being demoralized, blacks from the most competitive schools are the most satisfied with their college experience. More than 90 percent of both blacks and whites in our survey said they were satisfied or very satisfied with their college experience, and blacks were even more inclined than whites to credit their undergraduate experience with helping them learn crucial skills. We found no evidence that significant numbers of blacks felt stigmatized by race-sensitive policies. Only seven percent of black graduates said they would not attend the same selective college if they had to choose again.

Former students of all races reported feeling that learning to live and work effectively with members of other races is important. Large majorities also believed that their college experience contributed a lot in this respect. Consequently, almost 80 percent of the white graduates favored either retaining the current emphasis on enrolling a diverse class or emphasizing it more. Their minority classmates supported these policies even more strongly.

Some critics allege that race-sensitive admissions policies aggravate racial tensions by creating resentment among white and Asian students rejected by colleges they hoped to attend. Although we could not test this possibility definitively, we did examine the feelings of white students in our sample who had been rejected by their first-choice school. They said they supported an emphasis on diversity just as strongly as students who got into their first-choice schools.

Our findings also clarify the much misunderstood concept of merit in college admission. Many people suppose that all students with especially high grades and test scores "deserve" to be admitted and that it is unfair to reject them in favor of minority applicants with lower grades and test scores. But selective colleges do not automatically offer admission as a reward for past performance to anyone. Nor should they. For any institution, choosing fairly, "on the merits,"

means selecting applicants by criteria that are reasonably related to the purposes of the organization. For colleges and universities, this means choosing academically qualified applicants who not only give promise of doing well academically, but who also can enlarge the understanding of other students and contribute after graduation to their professions and communities. Though clearly relevant, grades and test scores are by no means all that matter.

Accordingly, an admissions policy that relied primarily on test scores would lead to the rejection of qualified minority students. The fact that, nationally, blacks are very underrepresented at the higher levels and very overrepresented at the lower levels ensures that they will have substantially lower average SAT scores even if a college were to use precisely the same SAT cut-off in admitting white and black students. For example, if a school admitted every applicant with SAT scores over 1100 and none with lower scores, the white students would still have a higher average SAT score than the black students because relatively more of them score at the upper end of the SAT distribution. This result occurs even though *no* racial preference was given in this hypothetical situation.

As a group, however, the black applicants are highly qualified. Of the black applicants at five of the 28 schools for which detailed admission data were available in 1989, over 90 percent scored above the national average for black test-takers on both the verbal and math SATs, considered separately. The large majority of these black applicants handily outscored not only the average black test-taker, but also the average white test-taker. Moreover, the average SAT score for black matriculants in 1989 was slightly higher than the average SAT score for *all* matriculants in 1951.

Talk of basing admissions mainly on test scores and grades assumes a model of admissions radically different from the one that exists today. Such a policy would mandate a fundamental change of direction for institutions that recognize the many dimensions of "qualification": the importance of a good fit between the student and the educational

program, the varied paths that individuals follow in developing their abilities, and the pitfalls of basing assessments of talent and potential solely on narrowly defined quantitative measures. Instead, as I described earlier, admissions officers have been "picking and choosing," as we believe they should always do -- admitting the candidate who seems to offer something special by way of drive and determination, the individual with a set of skills that matches well the academic requirements of the institution, someone who will bring another dimension of diversity to the student body, or a candidate who helps the institution fulfill a particular aspect of its mission.

Because other factors are important -- including hard-to-quantify attributes such as determination, motivation, creativity and character -- many talented students, white and black, are rejected even though they finished in the top 5 percent of their high school class. The applicants selected are students who were also above a high academic threshold but who seemed to have a greater chance of enhancing the education of their classmates and making a substantial contribution to their professions and society. Seen from the perspective of how well they served the missions of these educational institutions, the students admitted were surely "meritorious."

Could the values of diversity be achieved equally well without considering race explicitly? The Texas legislature has tried to do so by guaranteeing admission to the state's public universities for all students who finish in the top 10 percent of their high school class. Others have suggested using income rather than race to achieve diversity. The available evidence indicates that neither alternative is likely to be as effective as race-sensitive admissions in enrolling an academically well prepared and diverse student body. First, the Texas approach would admit some students from weaker high schools while turning down better-prepared applicants who happen not to finish in the top tenth of their class in academically stronger schools. So long as high schools differ so substantially in the academic abilities of their students and the level of difficulty of their courses,

treating all applicants alike if they finished above a given high school class rank provides a spurious form of equality that is likely to damage the academic profile of the overall class of students admitted to selective institutions. Instead of being an effective substitute for race-sensitive admissions policies, this approach could well have the effect of diminishing the pool of students who can compete effectively for the most demanding positions of leadership in business, government, and the professions.

Second, income-based strategies are unlikely to be good substitutes for race-sensitive admissions policies because there are simply too few blacks and Latinos from poor families who have strong enough academic records to qualify for admission to highly selective institutions. Children from poor black and Hispanic families make up less than half of all poor children and are much less likely than poor whites to excel in school. For example, the data show that among all students from families with incomes under \$20,000 who also finished in the top tenth percent of their high school class, only one in six is black or Hispanic. Thus, moving from a race-sensitive admissions policy to a class-based one would substantially reduce the minority enrollments at selective institutions, and severely impair current efforts to achieve racial diversity.

What would happen if universities were flatly prohibited from considering race in admissions? Our findings suggest that over half of the black students in selective colleges today would have been rejected. Plainly, the educational benefits that students gain from learning from each other would be lost. Furthermore, we can estimate what else would be lost as a result:

- Of the more than 700 black students who would have been rejected in 1976 under a race-neutral standard, more than 225 went on to earn doctorates or degrees in law, medicine or business. Approximately 70 are now doctors and roughly 60 are lawyers. Almost 125 are business executives. The average earnings of all

700 exceeds \$71,000, and well over 300 are leaders of civic organizations.

- The impact of race-neutral admissions would be especially drastic in admission to professional schools. The proportion of black students in the Top Ten law, business and medical schools would probably decline to less than 1 percent. These are the main professional schools from which most leading hospitals, law firms and corporations recruit. The result of race-neutral admissions, therefore, would be to damage severely the prospects for developing a larger minority presence in the corporate and professional leadership of America.

The reasons diversity has become so important at the highest levels of business, the professions, government, and society at large are readily apparent. By the year 2030, approximately 40 percent of all Americans are projected to be members of minority groups. More than \$600 billion in purchasing power is generated by minorities and more than one-third of all new entrants to the workforce are persons of color. In this environment, a diverse corporate leadership can be valuable both to understand the markets in which many companies sell and to recruit, manage, and motivate the workforce on which corporate performance ultimately depends. The chief executive officers of major corporations have so recognized. For example, the CEO of Coca-Cola has stated that, "[a]s a company that operates in nearly 200 countries, we see diversity in the background and talent of our associates as a competitive advantage and as a commitment that is a daily responsibility." Similarly, the CEO of Chrysler has stated that "we believe that workforce diversity is a competitive advantage. Our success as a global community is as dependent on utilizing the wealth of backgrounds, skills, and opinions that a

diverse workforce offers, as it is on raw materials, technology and processes."^{2/}

My own experience as a member of several corporate boards, including American Express and Merck & Co., confirms that these statements are echoed throughout the business community. I know that the business world has not failed to recognize and appreciate the importance of diversity. Corporations are making significant efforts in recruiting and retaining a workforce that values diversity and that can effectively conduct business worldwide. There is no question that graduates of universities with diverse populations -- whether minorities or nonminorities themselves -- offer the advantage of being valuable co-workers and managers in this increasingly diverse business climate.

Race remains a significant factor in our society. Race almost always affects an individual's life experiences and perspectives, and thus a person's capacity to contribute to the kinds of learning through diversity that occur on campuses. Both the growing diversity of American society and the increasing interaction with other cultures worldwide make it evident that going to school with "the likes of oneself" will be increasingly anachronistic. The advantages of being able to understand how others think and function, to cope across racial divides, and to lead groups composed of diverse individuals are certain to increase. Moreover, our survey data throw new light on the extent of interaction occurring on campuses today and of how positively the great majority of students regard opportunities to learn from those with different points of view, backgrounds, and experiences.

^{2/} M. Douglas Ivester (Chairman and CEO of The Coca-Cola Company) and Robert J. Eaton (Chairman and CEO of Chrysler Corporation), in Executive Council 1998, pp. 10, 34.

In sum, the data indicate that there is a statistically significant association between attendance at the most selective institutions and a variety of accomplishments during college and in later life. If, at the end of the day, the question is whether the most selective colleges and universities have succeeded in both enhancing the learning

experience for all students and educating sizable numbers of minority students who have already achieved considerable success and seem likely in time to occupy positions of leadership throughout society, I have no problem in answering the question -- absolutely.